

in the struggle against the segregation system," Jackson said. "It would be a confrontation at the production level with the power structure itself."

It Sort of Makes You Wonder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, later this session when the Ways and Means Committee brings before us legislation amending the social security law, it is my intention to offer an amendment excluding groups such as the Amish from enforced control under the law when requests to remain uncovered by social security is requested by religious groups.

The constant harrassment of Amish and similar tiny groups was dramatically and forcefully reported in an article by Columnist Jenkin Lloyd Jones in yesterday's Washington Evening Star. The article is not only timely but raises interesting points upon which we all should ponder. I insert the article at this point for the RECORD:

IT SORT OF MAKES YOU WONDER—GOVERNMENT PUTS BEATS ON THE DOLE, BUT BADGERS THE SELF-SUFFICIENT AMISH

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

NEW YORK CITY.—I am sitting in this little coffeehouse on Third Street in Greenwich Village watching the beats.

The place is a gutted-out store with bare brick walls and rough pine tables and benches. It is decorated with some far-out pieces of art, reminding you of finger painting day in kindergarten. Right in front of a strong spotlight is a raised platform of unpainted boards that holds one straight chair. You can either sit in the chair or stand and place your foot on the seat, depending on how you like to wallop the gultar.

Coffee is a dollar a mug and the enter-tainers make their pittance by passing around a basket. Here and there a tourist will drop in a buck, but the Greenwich Village habitués rarely toss in more than a dime. It seems to work out that the more you are with it the less you give.

Down the street and around the corner there are larger and more famous places where you can buy wine and where combos alternate with unwashed people reciting dirty blank verse with great attention to its "social protest." It is in these brassier coffeehouses that the ban-the-bomb and justice-for-Castro crowd hangs out, perhaps because there are more people to see them.

But my little coffeehouse is for the beat-Puritans. Only coffee. Only folk music.

Folk music is simple and uncomplicated, born of log cabins and campfires, and sad with unrequited love and untimely death. You watch the spectators. Long-haired boys clad in stained slacks and open shirts. Frowzy girls with unwashed hair, studied in their ugliness. And you think what a colossal joke it is that these who profess to despise uniformity have slipped into an easily recognizable uniform, the uniform of the slob.

But there is something more. Here are many able-bodied young people who not only accept but seek public welfare payments. Yet they pride themselves upon their com-

passion for the poor who, if they are to be helped, must be helped by the labor of someone. Here are the pleaders for peace at any price who have never tasted the horrors of war but who have concluded that no cause is worth dying for.

Here are the laughers at law, the scornors of morality, the rejectors of thrift, the scoffers at squares who work—absorbed completely in the quest for their own self-satisfaction. And they gather in this smoky grotto to stare at the ceiling, to twitch their shoulders and softly snap their fingers as the gultar men and women sing music that is easy on the brain.

So, to the Amish. Later I was at Lancaster, Pa., and a friend lent me his car so that I might drive out into the beautiful farm country where the barns are the fattest, the cattle the sleekest, and the fields the neatest in all America.

There are some striking parallels between the Amish and the beats. For both, beards are the style. Both dress peculiarly. And while the beats seek the simplicity of primitive music the Amish turn their backs on modern machinery and drive the Pennsylvania roads in their black buggies.

There are, however, a few differences.

The Amish have no divorce, no crime, no juvenile delinquency, no unemployment or old-age problems. They take care of their own. They refuse Government subsidies. They take no money for not plowing a field. They dislike insurance. If a barn burns the whole community rushes to rebuild it. Because they supply their own social security they object to social security taxes.

This has brought down upon them the wrath of the huge national bureaucracy which sees only chaos if some people are permitted to look elsewhere than to the Government for their welfare. So the Amish have been repeatedly yanked into the Federal courts. A couple of years ago Government agents even seized Amish horses at plowing time to satisfy social security judgments.

We have a system of government under which all beats are comfortable and the Amish are bullied and badgered.

It sort of makes you wonder.

Profile in Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following poem by my good friend Jack Brandon, of Brooklyn, N.Y., about our late beloved President, John F. Kennedy.

The poem follows:

PROFILE IN COURAGE

PT 109 and the bad back,
Cuba, 1963, and the backdown,
ICBM and peace through strength,
Test ban treaty and Russia is severed from
China,
The hundred-year-old promise to the colored
man kept,
The arts honored at last,
And in the White House!
Let the blasts of the eternal trumpet cleave
the air,
For arm in arm, models and friends, Jeffer-
son, J. Q. Adams
And J.F.K. are there.

—JACK BRANDON.

Need To Reduce Beef Imports Emphasized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a proposal, H.R. 10172, which would roll back the level of imports of beef, veal, and mutton to a level of the 5-year average ending on December 31, 1963. In view of the voluntary agreements entered into a short time ago with Australia and New Zealand, and now with Ireland, to effect a mere 6-percent reduction from the high levels of 1963, it is a matter of urgent necessity that we here in the Congress take action to bring adequate relief to the depressed livestock markets here in our own country.

I have received a letter from Mr. George E. Carlson, of Carlson Farms, Waconia, Minn., presenting comments on what a healthy livestock industry means to the entire economy. Hardship among the Nation's livestock producers is not an isolated situation—continued low prices in the livestock markets will effect all those industries which depend for a substantial share of their income on a vigorous livestock industry.

Mr. Carlson's letter follows:

CARLSON FARMS,

Waconia, Minn., February 27, 1964.

HON. ANCHER NELSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: This may come as a surprise, but we in the beef industry are in big trouble. Why? Because overly generous import quotas on beef and veal are pushing domestic prices lower and lower.

After feeding the 1,200 Herefords yearly on our feeding lot, we will be forced to discontinue our cattle operation unless we get relief in the form of improved prices. There are those who will say, "A beef feeder is quitting business. So what?" Here's what: Halting our cattle business will remove about \$400,000 a year in revenue from the economy of the community of Waconia, Minn.

This not only pinches the local economy, but affects the many people in various businesses who sell products and services to us, and causes unemployment. There's the breeder and calf ranchers, yearling ranchers, cowhands, feed lot operators, bankers, feed chemists, refiners, flour mills, veterinarians, farmers, truckdrivers, railroaders, stockyard men and many others whose livelihood is tied to the domestic beef industry.

Multiply our situation by that of thousands of others who are feeling the cost-price squeeze and you soon have a sick beef industry.

If the import situation wasn't bad enough, we learn that foreign aid money is now being used to set up other countries in the beef business. That's all we need. Operating at far lower costs, they can then import to us at our expense to drive our beef industry completely out of business, which would seriously damage our national economy.

All of this is caused by uninformed people in Government who simply don't know much about farming and cattle raising. Unless one has had the experience of owning, operating, and managing in the cattle farm

business, he can't possibly make a qualified decision on these matters.

A healthy, job-providing beef industry can produce sufficient beef for our own national consumption and take care of our yearly increase in population as well. To make this possible, legislation must be passed to reduce imports of beef and veal to the 1958-60 average levels, which was about 5 percent of U.S. production.

We will appreciate your studied consideration of this matter and await your reply as to what you and other Members of Congress can do to help us.

Respectfully yours,

GEO. E. CARLSON.

American Legion in Panama Canal Zone Protests Hiring of Panamanians as Canal Zone Policemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was passed by the American Legion Department of the Panama Canal Zone and should be of interest to the Members of the House of Representatives:

RESOLUTION BY THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF THE PANAMA CANAL ZONE

Whereas the duties and responsibilities of U.S. citizen policemen in the Canal Zone demand of this individual unquestioned loyalty and allegiance to the United States; and

Whereas these policemen must meet every security criteria conceived by law and regulations necessary to the safeguarding of life and property and to insure continuity and capability of operation and administration of Canal Zone activities under any circumstances by the U.S. Government; and

Whereas a Panamanian police candidate in taking an oath of office would not and could not pledge an oath of loyalty and allegiance to the U.S. Government; and

Whereas this hiring of Panamanians as Canal Zone policemen would be interpreted by citizens of the Republic of Panama as another act of appeasement and reaffirmation of their demands for complete absolute sovereignty within the Canal Zone; Therefore be it

Resolved by the Department Executive Committee, the American Legion, Department of the Panama Canal Zone, meeting at the American Legion Club, February 14, 1964, To oppose the hiring of Panamanian citizens as policemen in the Canal Zone as a threat to national security of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That we protest the hiring of Panamanians as Canal Zone policemen as a violation of the Canal Zone Code (title 2, sec. 147, Security Positions) which requires the use of U.S. citizens to insure continuity and capability of operation and administration of activities in the Canal Zone by the U.S. Government; and be it further

Resolved, That we request the Congress of the United States to refuse any and all requests for monetary appropriations for which any part will be used to pay the salaries of Panamanians hired as policemen in the Canal Zone; and be it finally

Resolved, That we advise all concerned of this new threat to U.S. control over the Canal Zone.

Soviet Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter and resolution on Soviet anti-Semitism which speaks clearly on a cause for concern by all right-thinking men. I refer to the anti-Semitism now rampant in the Soviet Union which is destroying the cultural and religious identity of Jews within the U.S.S.R. Certainly this matter deserves the attention of all Americans and of the United Nations:

JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL
OF METROPOLITAN DETROIT,
February 20, 1964.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: The deteriorating situation of Jews resident in the Soviet Union is a source of deep alarm and concern to our community. As an expression of this apprehension, our delegate assembly, at its last quarterly meeting, adopted the resolution which is enclosed.

We bring this to your attention in the hope that every appropriate diplomatic and other action may be undertaken through our Government to halt the religious and cultural genocide being perpetrated against the Jewish community in the Soviet Union. The fact that these repressive measures are in contradistinction to the status accorded other cultural and religious minorities emphasizes for us the urgency of the problem.

Respectfully yours,

SIDNEY M. SHEVITZ,
President.
WALTER KLEIN,
Executive Director.

RESOLUTION ON SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

The Delegate Assembly of the Jewish Community Council, composed of representatives of 340 Jewish member organizations in the Metropolitan Detroit area, deplores the continuing perpetration of cultural and religious genocide against Jews in the Soviet Union by the Soviet Government. Official restrictions imposed upon the 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union deny to them their freedom of worship, isolate them from their tradition and from their coreligionists in other parts of the world, and destroy their specifically Jewish spirit.

Prohibitions against the making or importation of Jewish religious objects—of prayer shawls, phylacteries, prayerbooks, Bibles, religious calendars—and against maintaining spiritual ties with coreligionists abroad, are indications of the harsh and restrictive discriminatory measures. Jewish religious and cultural life is further circumscribed by restrictions against the Yiddish theater and press, religious schools, publishing of books in Yiddish and Hebrew. Traditional burial is proscribed and much anguish is occasioned by the suffering thus imposed.

All of these restrictions are in contradistinction to the status accorded to other nationality and religious minorities resident in the Soviet Union.

We, therefore, call upon the Soviet authorities to implement their often repeated concern for, and championship of,

freedom for all nationalities and groups, by according to Soviet Jews the same status and conditions enjoyed by other groupings of Soviet citizens, and to restore to the U.S.S.R.'s Jewish citizens their rights to:

1. Jewish education in all its forms.
2. Continuity of Jewish cultural life through literature, theater, schools, press, publishing houses and other forms of cultural expression in Yiddish and in Hebrew.
3. Reopening of synagogues to serve the religious needs of Soviet Jewry.
4. Jewish ritual observance in its traditional forms.
5. Reestablishment of religious and cultural bonds with Jewish communities abroad.

6. Be reunited with their families in other lands, from whom they have been separated.

We appeal to the Soviet Government—as a matter of urgency and elementary decency—to recognize the rights of Jews to their own language, religious and cultural expression to the degree permitted to all other ethnic groups in the Soviet Union.

Our call also goes out to the Secretary General of the United Nations, to use his good offices and the machinery of this world body, of which the Soviet Union is a member Nation, to act against the cultural and religious genocide being perpetrated against Soviet Jewry.

We also call upon the Government of the United States, our President, our Secretary of State, our Congressmen, and our Ambassador to the United Nations, to protest to the Soviet Government, through diplomatic and other channels, against the oppressions herein detailed.

The officers of the Jewish Community Council are instructed to send copies of this resolution to the officials above mentioned, and to take all appropriate measures to the accomplishment of these ends, independently and in concert with national agencies and other like minded groups.

Is It Wrong To Do the Best You Can?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a recent ruling by the National Labor Relations Board raises the question of whether it is wrong to do the very best you can. The ruling also raises the question as to whether ambition and superiority are to be penalized and whether mediocrity is a proper goal.

If the NLRB ruling that a union member can be fined for exceeding his work quota is to stand, there is no question that we have taken one more step toward communism and away from the private enterprise system where one individual can get ahead by doing better than his competitor.

In the February 26 issue of the San Jose, Calif., Mercury, a splendid editorial appeared with respect to this ruling of the NLRB. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the editorial herewith:

NLRB LAUNCHES A DANGEROUS TREND

The National Labor Relations Board appears to be moving slowly but steadily toward a position where the American work-